FOOD LAWS

Some countries, notably in the E.E.C., have established unreasonable food laws regulating the use of pesticide chemicals for both pre-harvest and post-harvest use, which could restrict U.S. exports. Other nations are working to establish such laws.

Presently the situation is not most acute for post-harvest chemicals. Because of the slowness in adotping the latest and best technical know-how to provide the best possible safe product to the consumer, and because of the nearness to their markets, the domestic producers in practically all the European countries do not use these post-harvest chemicals which are in common use in the U.S., and which have been judged to not endanger the public health by the World's leading health body, namely, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

In the U.S. over 75% of the "fresh" apple tonnage is placed in cold storage and is shipped to domestic and foreign markets during the ensuing 10 or 12 months. The need to use the latest approved scientific advancements to provide consumers with a satisfactory product is readily apparent. Unreasonable food laws should not be allowed to restrict U.S. exports simply because they are not needed or used in other countries.

While post-harvest chemicals are of major concern now, unreasonable laws regulating pre-harvest chemicals could be of even greater importance in the years to come. Even in the U.S. the methods and safe chemicals needed to control insects and diseases vary from state to state. For example, because of the rainfall pattern, apple scab (a disease) is practically non-existent in the Northwest, whereas in the Northeast 6 to 14 sprays of approved, safe chemicals during the growing season are required for commercial control. The differences in the fungicide residues on the fruit between the two areas is apparent. Similar situations in overseas producing countries exist. Unreasonable food laws established on the use pattern in domestic orchards could completely stifle trade. The present pressure by overseas governments on our Government to drastically reduce long estabilshed DDT tolerances is a case in point.

FOREIGN TRADING BLOCS

Based on experience to date we are strongly opposed to the U.S. encouragement of such blocs. In every instance the theme of these blocs seems to be one of "protectionism" to the detriment of U.S. industries, and especially the Apple and Pear Industry. It is already apparent that the U.S. is on the outside looking in while other countries grant special privileges to one another. This point was fully covered by the U.S. National Fruit Export Council.

A case in point is Brazil. They are members of LAFTA as is Argentina. Brazil does not grow apples and pears. Argentina does. The Brazilian duty on apples and pears is excessive and restricts trade. The U.S. Government and Industry has been working hard to secure a reasonable duty. Our efforts have been violently opposed by Argentina despite the fact we would not be competitive in the Brazilian markets because of our reverse harvest seasons. Brazil does not impose any duty on Argentine fruit.

Further, Brazil has imposed an 18% "sales tax" on U.S. apples and pears. This tax is not applicable to fruit from LAFTA countries and is in direct violation of GATT.

MOST FAVORED NATION

The U.S. grants MFN treatment to all countries, except some Communist bloc countries, even though many of these countries have no treaty or agreement with the U.S. and do not grant MFN treatment to us.

We believe most strongly that the U.S. should grant MFN treatment only to those countries that grant such treatment to us.

Since this subject is covered in the statement of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, we do not feel it is necessary to elaborate here.

DUTIES

An examination of the appended tables concerning "Rates of Duty for Imports Into Specified Countries" on apples and pears can only result in the conclusion that exports of U.S. apples and pears are confronted with excessive to insurmountable duties in many, if not most, of the countries around the world. This is especially true in Latin American countries, Brazil, Sweden, Norway and